

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

01/30/2008 16:09 FAX 603 624 9229

DAVIS & BUJOLD, PLLC

008/013

10/696,382

REMARKS

The title of the Invention is amended to overcome the Examiner's objection concerning the same. If the amended title is not believed to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, the Applicant looks forward to any proposed title amendment the Examiner may care to make concerning the same.

The objection raised with respect to the Abstract of the Disclosure is overcome by the above newly entered Abstract. If any further amendment to the Abstract of the Disclosure is believed necessary, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss the proposed change(s) to the same.

With respect to the drawing amendment, the Applicant respectfully submits that FIG. 1 diagrammatically shows an elevator shaft 11 with an elevator car 12 located therein. The elevator car 12 has a door 13 and a camera 21 located in the upper right hand corner of the car 12. The elevator car 12 is movable along the elevator shaft 11, by a cable 14A and a hoist 14, to access different floors 15-19 of a structure which is diagrammatically shown. As the elevator shaft 11 includes the elevator car 12, the elevator car 12 includes the camera 21 and the hoist 14 includes a portion of the cable 14A, the Applicant believes that this Figure does not contain any "rectangular boxes" which necessitate labeling as required by 37 CFR 1.83(a). However, if the Examiner further objects to the drawings for the reasons noted in this Official Action, the Applicant kindly requests identification of the "blank rectangular box(es)" which the Examiner believes require labeling such that the Applicant can thereafter appropriately amend FIG. 1.

Next, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons noted in the official action. The subject matter of claim 12 is canceled from this application thereby overcoming the raised rejection.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

01/30/2006 16:09 FAX 603 624 9229

DAVIS & BUJOLD, PLLC

009/013

10/696,382

Lastly, claims 7, 9 and 11 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Kaneko et al. '860. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised anticipatory rejection in view of the following remarks.

Kaneko et al. '860 relates to an elaborate elevator control system which has a number of "image pickup devices" such as photo-electric beams, cameras, and ultrasonic transmitter-receivers. These devices are used to detect a person(s) waiting to enter an elevator as well as passengers in the elevators (or "cages"). These devices are used also used to detect the number of people exiting or getting off the elevator.

The signals from these image pickup devices are processed to calculate the number of people either entering or exiting the elevator at each floor. One object of the Kaneko et al. '860 invention is to provide for control of the cage service to be varied in dependence on the situation of persons waiting in halls and passengers in cages. Kaneko et al. '860 exemplifies several embodiments of his invention which are necessarily fairly complex with hardware including scanners at each hall and in each car and control processing arrangements providing for centralized control of the cage movements. It would appear that the systems are intended for several elevator systems involving a number of cages. The purpose of this elevator traffic demand detector appears to be a system to detect various types of information on traffic demand.

It should be noted that according to Kaneko et al. '860, a first tv camera found in the elevator may communicate or "cooperate" with one or more of a second camera outside the elevator, a mat or an ultrasonic-detector. However, after a thorough and careful review of this reference, it is nowhere disclosed, suggested or taught to juxtapose the first camera with the second camera. That is, nowhere does a scanning device of the car juxtapose or align with the scanning extension of the immediate floor.

120081-1027 AM

- 8 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

01/30/2008 16:10 FAX 603 624 9229

DAVIS & BUJOLD, PLLC

010/013

10/696,382

Lastly, claims 7, 9 and 11 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Kaneko et al. '860. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised anticipatory rejection in view of the following remarks.

Kaneko et al. '860 relates to an elaborate elevator control system which has a number of "image pickup devices" such as photo-electric beams, cameras, and ultrasonic transmitter-receivers. These devices are used to detect a person(s) waiting to enter an elevator as well as passengers in the elevators (or "cages"). These devices are also used to detect the number of people exiting or getting off the elevator.

The signals from these image pickup devices are processed to calculate the number of people either entering or exiting the elevator at each floor. One object of the Kaneko et al. '860 invention is to provide for control of the cage service to be varied in dependence on the situation of persons waiting in halls and passengers in cages. Kaneko et al. '860 exemplifies several embodiments of his invention which are necessarily fairly complex with hardware including scanners at each hall and in each car and control processing arrangements providing for centralized control of the cage movements. It would appear that the systems are intended for several elevator systems involving a number of cages. The purpose of this elevator traffic demand detector appears to be a system to detect various types of information on traffic demand.

It should be noted that according to Kaneko et al. '860, a first tv camera found in the elevator may communicate or "cooperate" with one or more of a second camera outside the elevator, a mat or an ultrasonic-detector. However, after a thorough and careful review of this reference, it is nowhere disclosed, suggested or taught to juxtapose the first camera with the second camera. That is, nowhere does a scanning device of the car juxtapose or align with the scanning extension of the immediate floor.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

01/30/2006 16:10 FAX 603 624 9229

DAVIS & BUJOLD, PLLC

011/013

10/696,382

The presently claimed invention is concerned with an elevator system in which an elevator is equipped with a scanner, such as a video camera, and a scanning extension is provided at each floor station at which the elevator can stop. When the elevator stops at a given floor station, the scanner and the extension at that floor are juxtaposed or aligned and function as an operable combination by means of which an access region on that floor for the elevator can be scanned for the presence of a waiting passenger(s). Thus for a given lift installation, only one camera is required for a car along with an extension for each floor station that the car stops at or visits. The present application is not concerned with image processing of the output of the operable combination as with the applied prior art.

In order to emphasize the above noted distinctions between the presently claimed invention and the applied art, independent claim 13 (corresponding to previous claim 7) of this application recites the features of

... providing the lift car with a scanning device directed outwardly from the lift car; providing an independent scanning extension at each of the at least two or more stations; upon arrival of the lift car at one station of the at least two or more stations equipped with the scanning extension, aligning the scanning device with the scanning extension at the one station in a juxtaposed arrangement to form an operable combination; scanning a predetermined region at the one station by the operable combination to provide an output signal representing a state of the predetermined region indicating whether or not the predetermined region is occupied. . . .

Independent claim 15 (corresponding to previous claim 9) recites the features of

... the lift system comprising a scanning device, supported by the lift car, and being directed outwardly of the lift car, a scanning extension at each of the separate stations at which the lift car can be stopped, and when the lift car is stopped at a given station, the scanning extension is juxtaposed with the scanning device of the given station to provide a combined unit directed at

10/696,382

a predetermined region of the given station, and the scanning device is adapted to provide on an output signal representing a state of the predetermined region . . .

Independent claim 18 includes the features of

. . . providing the elevator car with a camera mounted thereon with the camera facing outwardly from the elevator car; providing one of a reflective and a refractive component at each of the at least two floors; when the elevator car stops at a desired floor of the at least two floors, aligning the scanning device with one of the reflective and the refractive component to form an operable combination; scanning the elevator entry with the operable combination to provide an output signal representing an elevator entry state indicating whether or not the elevator entry is occupied.

Such features are believed to clearly and patentably distinguish the presently claimed invention from all of the art of record, including the applied art.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 8 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In accordance with this indication, new claim 18 is written to include the allowable subject matter of claim 8 combined with the subject matter of the original claim 7 and this new independent claim is now believed to be allowable.

If any further amendment to this application is believed necessary to advance prosecution and place this case in allowable form, the Examiner is courteously solicited to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to discuss the same.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn at this time. If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's view concerning the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection(s) or applicability of the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

01/30/2006 16:10 FAX 603 624 9229

DAVIS & BUJOLD, PLLC

013/013

10/696,382

Kaneko et al. '860 reference, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the specific passage or passages, or the drawing or drawings, which contain the necessary teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure required by case law. As such teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure is not present in the applied references, the raised rejection should be withdrawn at this time. Alternatively, if the Examiner is relying on his/her expertise in this field, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter an affidavit substantiating the Examiner's position so that suitable contradictory evidence can be entered in this case by the Applicant.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the raised rejections should be withdrawn and this application is now placed in a condition for allowance. Action to that end, in the form of an early Notice of Allowance, is courteously solicited by the Applicant at this time.

The Applicant respectfully requests that any outstanding objection(s) or requirement(s), as to the form of this application, be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated for this case.

In the event that there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge the same or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account (Account No. 04-0213).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Bujold, Reg. No. 32,018
Customer No. 020210
Davis & Bujold, P.L.L.C.
Fourth Floor
500 North Commercial Street
Manchester NH 03101-1151
Telephone 603-624-9220
Facsimile 603-624-9229
E-mail: patent@davisandbujold.com